RECEIVED

DAVID J. MEYER
VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF COUNSEL FOR
REGULATORY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
AVISTA CORPORATION
1411 E. MISSION AVENUE
P.O. BOX 3727
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99220
PHONE: (509) 495-4316, FAX: (509) 495-8851

2016 AUG - 1 AM 9: 09

IDANO PUBLIC
COMMISSION

### BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE POWER COST	)	CASE NO. AVU-E-16- <u>05</u>
ADJUSTMENT (PCA) ANNUAL RATE	)	
ADJUSTMENT FILING OF AVISTA	)	DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
CORPORATION	)	WILLIAM G. JOHNSON

FOR AVISTA CORPORATION

### I. INTRODUCTION

- 2 Q. Please state your name, business address, and present
- 3 position with Avista Corporation.

1

- 4 A. My name is William G. Johnson. My business address
- 5 is 1411 East Mission Avenue, Spokane, Washington, and I am
- 6 employed by Avista Utilities ("Avista" or "Company") as a
- 7 Wholesale Marketing Manager in the Energy Resources Department.
- 8 Q. What is your educational background?
- 9 A. I graduated from the University of Montana in 1981
- 10 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science/Economics.
- 11 I obtained a Master of Arts Degree in Economics from the
- 12 University of Montana in 1985.
- 13 Q. How long have you been employed by the Company and
- 14 what are your duties as a Wholesale Marketing Manager?
- 15 A. I started working for Avista in April 1990 as a
- 16 Demand Side Resource Analyst. I joined the Energy Resources
- 17 Department as a Power Contracts Analyst in June 1996. My
- 18 primary responsibilities involve power contract origination
- 19 and management and power supply regulatory issues.
- 20 Q. What is the scope of your testimony in this
- 21 proceeding?
- 22 A. My testimony will provide a brief summary of the
- 23 factors driving power supply expenses during the review period
- 24 July 2015 through June 2016. I also describe new long-term

l contracts the Company entered into during the deferral period

2 and the supporting documentation that is provided in electronic

3 format.

4

5

### II. SUMMARY OF DEFERRALS

6 Q. Would you please summarize power supply expenses
7 during the July 2015 through June 2016 review period?

8 A. Yes. During the review period, Idaho's share of

9 power supply expenses was lower than the authorized level by

10 \$1,901,800, not including the net changes in costs associated

11 with the Clearwater Paper electric service agreement or the

12 credit to Idaho for RECs used to meet Washington RPS. Under

13 the 90% / 10% PCA sharing, a balance of \$1,711,620 is due to

14 customers in rebate direction.

15 Certain changes in revenues and expenses are tracked at

16 100% in the PCA, per prior Commission orders. The Clearwater

17 Paper power purchase expense and the Clearwater Paper retail

18 revenue related to the level of Clearwater generation is one

19 such item. The difference between actual costs/revenues and

20 authorized costs/revenues related to Clearwater Paper power

21 purchase expense and retail revenue was \$1,267,440 in the

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  The Clearwater Paper power purchase and revenue associated with the purchase is tracked at 100% in the PCA per Idaho Public Utilities Commission Order No. 32841 dated June 28, 2013.

- 1 surcharge direction. The other item tracked at 100% in the
- 2 PCA is the credit for RECs used to meet Washington RPS. This
- 3 credit is based on the Idaho allocation of RECs that were
- 4 retired to meet Washington RPS that would have otherwise been
- 5 sold. The credit to Idaho customers related to retired RECs
- 6 was approximately \$39,000.
- 7 The net impact of these three items is a net deferral for
- 8 the July 2015 through June 2016 time period of \$483,157 in the
- 9 rebate direction. Combined with interest, the total deferral
- 10 balance is \$478,103 in the rebate direction.
- 11 Q. What factors contributed to the lower power supply
- 12 expense during the review period?
- 13 A. Overall, lower power supply costs were due primarily
- 14 to favorable natural gas and wholesale power prices, and lower
- 15 net expense for Colstrip and Kettle Falls generation.
- 16 Offsetting most of the lower net expense was the expense
- 17 resulting from lower hydro generation, Palouse Wind and
- 18 Clearwater Paper.
- 19 Palouse Wind is currently not included in the authorized
- 20 level of power supply expense (i.e., it is not included in base
- 21 rates). Ninety-percent of the actual Palouse Wind expense is
- 22 included in the computation of the PCA deferral, per the
- 23 Settlement in Case No. AVU-E-15-05. The credit to Idaho

- 1 customers related to Palouse Wind RECs in the July 2015 through
- 2 June 2016 time period was approximately \$307,000.
- 3 The expense related to Clearwater Paper is a result of
- 4 the change in the contract between Avista and Clearwater Paper,
- 5 whereby Clearwater now generates into its own load as opposed
- 6 to selling their full generation output to Avista, and
- 7 receiving retail service from Avista for their full load. The
- 8 PCA authorized base for the July 2015 through December 2015
- 9 time period included the purchase by Avista of Clearwater
- 10 generation and Clearwater purchasing an equivalent amount of
- 11 power at retail rates. This contract, a Power Purchase and
- 12 Sale Agreement ("Purchase Contract"), was approved by the
- 13 Commission in Case No. AVU-E-03-07.
- 14 Given that the power purchase rate was lower than retail
- 15 rates, when the Clearwater Purchase Contract ended on June 30,
- 16 2013 Clearwater chose to use its generation to reduce purchases
- 17 from Avista. The result was a net increase in PCA surcharge
- 18 deferrals. In Case No. AVU-E-15-05, Avista's 2015 general rate
- 19 case, the effects of the 2013 Clearwater Paper electric service
- 20 agreement were incorporated into base rates effective January
- 21 1, 2016, and the Purchase Contract was removed from the PCA
- 22 authorized base. As such, the deferral related to the prior
- 23 Clearwater Paper Purchase Contract ended January 1, 2016.

The table below shows a summary of the major factors driving the deferrals during the review period.

Factors Contributing to Increased (Decreased) Power Supply E July 2015 - June 2016 - Idaho Allocation	expense
Change due to Hydro Generation (1)	\$6,569,08
Change due to Power and Natural Gas Prices and Contract Changes, (2)	-\$10,295,74
Change due to Colstrip Generation and Fuel Expense	-\$705,58
Change due to Kettle Falls Generation and Fuel Expense	-\$764,34
Change in Net Transmission Expense (Expense - Revenue)	\$3,683
REC Sale Revenue	-\$966,03
Palouse Wind Purchase (3)	\$3,930,228
Change due to Retail Loads (4)	\$326,92
Total Expenses Above (Below) the Authorized Level	-\$1,901,800
10% Company Sharing	\$190,186
Idaho Share of WA RPS Compliance RECs (5)	-\$38,978
Clearwater Paper Generation and Revenue Variance (6)	\$1,267,44
Total Power Cost Deferrals, Surcharge (Rebate)	-\$483,15

- 1) Includes the change in hydro generation plus changes in Mid Columbia contract expenses.
- 2) Includes the effect of gas-fired turbine optimization, power and gas price changes and other contract expense and revenue changes.
- 3) This is the Palouse power purchase net expense.

- 4) Includes the reduced expense of lower sales net of the Load Growth Adjustment Rate surcharge.
- This is the credit from Washington customers to Idaho customers for the value of RECs retired to meet Washington RPS.
- 6) The expense related to Clearwater Paper is a result of the change in the contract between Avista and Clearwater Paper, whereby Clearwater now generates into its own load as opposed to selling their full generation output to Avista under the 2003 Power Purchase and Sale Agreement. Effective 1/1/2016, the expired Power Purchase and Sale Agreement was removed from the authorized base, and therefore the variance between authorized and actual is no longer tracked in the PCA.

Over the review period, hydro generation was 71 aMW above the authorized level. Gas-fired generation was 22 aMW higher the authorized level. Colstrip generation was 5 aMW below the authorized level and Kettle Falls generation was 3 aMW above

- 1 the authorized levels. Idaho retail sales were 8 aMW below
- 2 the authorized level.
- 3 The table below shows the change in generation and retail
- 4 loads from the authorized levels.

5	July 15 - June 16 Generation and Load Differences from the Authorized Level		
6		<u>Change</u> aMW	Change %
7	Change in Hydro Generation	-71.1	-13.1%
8	Change in Gas-Fired Generation	21.7	5.8%
9	Change in Colstrip Generation	-5.0	-2.8%
10	Change in Kettle Falls Generation	3.1	9.2%
11	Change in Idaho Retail Sales	-7.8	-2.3%

12

13

15

16

17

# III. NEW LONG-TERM CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO DURING THE

# 14 REVIEW PERIOD

- Q. Please provide a brief description of new long-term power contracts that the Company entered into during the review period.
- 18 A. The Company entered into one new long-term power 19 purchase contract during the review period. In December 2015, 20 the Company entered into a new/renewed four year contract with 21 Hydro Technology Systems, who operates a PURPA hydro facility 22 with a total nameplate capacity of 1.2 megawatts. A copy of 23 this contract is included with supporting documentation.

18

Position Reports: These daily reports show the Company's forward load/resource position, daily and term purchases each business day and forward market power and natural gas prices.

22 23 24

25

26

27

28

Forward Market Electric and Natural Gas Price Curves: daily data shows forward market prices electricity and natural gas and is maintained in Nucleus, the Company's electronic energy transaction database record system. Forward market prices are included in the daily Position Reports.

29 30 31

- Does that conclude your direct pre-filed testimony? Q.
- 32 Α. Yes.